



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/895,654

06/28/2001

Manoel Tenorio

020431.0841

6772

53184 7590 11/14/2008  
i2 TECHNOLOGIES US, INC.  
ONE i2 PLACE, 11701 LUNA ROAD  
DALLAS, TX 75234

EXAMINER

CHBOUKI, TAREK

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2165

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

11/14/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/895,654	<b>Applicant(s)</b> TENORIO, MANOEL	
	<b>Examiner</b> TAREK CHBOUKI	<b>Art Unit</b> 2165	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 July 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

***DETAILED ACTION***

**Response to Amendment**

This Office action has been issued in response to amendment filed on 07/25/2008

Claims 1-28 are pending. Applicants' arguments have been carefully and respectfully considered, a new ground of rejection is made. Accordingly, this action has been made FINAL necessitated by amendment.

**Response to Arguments**

Applicant's argument are moot in view the new ground of rejection.

With respect to Applicant's argument regarding the invalidity of 35 USC 101 made against claims 1, 9, 17 and 25-28. Examiner disagrees and maintains the rejection because as claimed the system is lacking a definite hardware components hence directed to a software per se.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

1. Claims 1-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 1 refers to a “electronic commerce system”. As cited on pages 6-8 of this instant specification, has provided evidence that the claimed system is a software per se, wherein a series of modules are to be executed. The claims do not define structural and functional descriptive material used in interrelationship between the computer software and the hardware like a memory or processor.

Art Unit: 2165

Descriptive material can be characterized as either “functional descriptive material” or “nonfunctional descriptive material.” Both types of “descriptive material” are nonstatutory when claimed as descriptive material *per se*, 33 F.3d at 1360, 31 USPQ2d at 1759. When functional descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable medium, it becomes structurally and functionally interrelated to the medium and will be statutory in most cases since use of technology permits the function of the descriptive material to be realized. Compare *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 1583-84, 32 USPQ2d 1031, 1035 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Claim 9 refers to a “method”. As cited on pages 6-8 of this instant specification, has provided evidence that the claimed method is a software *per se*, wherein a series of modules are to be executed. The claims do not define structural and functional descriptive material used in interrelationship between the computer software and the hardware like a memory or processor.

Descriptive material can be characterized as either “functional descriptive material” or “nonfunctional descriptive material.” Both types of “descriptive material” are nonstatutory when claimed as descriptive material *per se*, 33 F.3d at 1360, 31 USPQ2d at 1759. When functional descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable medium, it becomes structurally and functionally interrelated to the medium and will be statutory in most cases since use of technology permits the function of the descriptive material to be realized. Compare *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 1583-84, 32 USPQ2d 1031, 1035 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Claim 17 refers to a “software”. As cited on pages 6-8 of this instant specification, has provided evidence that the claimed “software” is a software *per se*, wherein a series of modules are to be executed. The claims do not define structural and functional descriptive material used in interrelationship between the computer software and the hardware like a memory or processor.

Descriptive material can be characterized as either “functional descriptive material” or “nonfunctional descriptive material.” Both types of “descriptive material” are nonstatutory when claimed as descriptive

Art Unit: 2165

material *per se*, 33 F.3d at 1360, 31 USPQ2d at 1759. When functional descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable medium, it becomes structurally and functionally interrelated to the medium and will be statutory in most cases since use of technology permits the function of the descriptive material to be realized. Compare *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 1583-84, 32 USPQ2d 1031, 1035 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Claim 25 refers to a “system”. As cited on pages 6-8 of this instant specification, has provided evidence that the claimed system is a software *per se*, wherein a series of modules are to be executed. The claims do not define structural and functional descriptive material used in interrelationship between the computer software and the hardware like a memory or processor.

Descriptive material can be characterized as either “functional descriptive material” or “nonfunctional descriptive material.” Both types of “descriptive material” are nonstatutory when claimed as descriptive material *per se*, 33 F.3d at 1360, 31 USPQ2d at 1759. When functional descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable medium, it becomes structurally and functionally interrelated to the medium and will be statutory in most cases since use of technology permits the function of the descriptive material to be realized. Compare *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 1583-84, 32 USPQ2d 1031, 1035 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Claim 26 refers to a “schema translation tool”. As cited on pages 6-8 of this instant specification, has provided evidence that the claimed “schema translation tool” is a software *per se*, wherein a series of modules are to be executed. The claims do not define structural and functional descriptive material used in interrelationship between the computer software and the hardware like a memory or processor.

Descriptive material can be characterized as either “functional descriptive material” or “nonfunctional descriptive material.” Both types of “descriptive material” are nonstatutory when claimed as descriptive material *per se*, 33 F.3d at 1360, 31 USPQ2d at 1759. When functional descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable medium, it becomes structurally and functionally interrelated to the medium and

will be statutory in most cases since use of technology permits the function of the descriptive material to be realized. Compare *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 1583-84, 32 USPQ2d 1031, 1035 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Claim 27 refers to a “method”. As cited on pages 6-8 of this instant specification, has provided evidence that the claimed “method” is a software per se, wherein a series of modules are to be executed. The claims do not define structural and functional descriptive material used in interrelationship between the computer software and the hardware like a memory or processor.

Descriptive material can be characterized as either “functional descriptive material” or “nonfunctional descriptive material.” Both types of “descriptive material” are nonstatutory when claimed as descriptive material *per se*, 33 F.3d at 1360, 31 USPQ2d at 1759. When functional descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable medium, it becomes structurally and functionally interrelated to the medium and will be statutory in most cases since use of technology permits the function of the descriptive material to be realized. Compare *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 1583-84, 32 USPQ2d 1031, 1035 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Claim 28 refers to a “software for translating between schema”. As cited on pages 6-8 of this instant specification, has provided evidence that the claimed “software for translating between schema” is a software per se, wherein a series of modules are to be executed. The claims do not define structural and functional descriptive material used in interrelationship between the computer software and the hardware like a memory or processor.

Descriptive material can be characterized as either “functional descriptive material” or “nonfunctional descriptive material.” Both types of “descriptive material” are nonstatutory when claimed as descriptive material *per se*, 33 F.3d at 1360, 31 USPQ2d at 1759. When functional descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable medium, it becomes structurally and functionally interrelated to the medium and

Art Unit: 2165

will be statutory in most cases since use of technology permits the function of the descriptive material to be realized. Compare *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 1583-84, 32 USPQ2d 1031, 1035 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-2, 5-10, 13-18 and 21-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Livesay, Jeffery et al (hereinafter Livesay) US Publication No 20080126265.

As per claim 1, Livesay discloses:

**An electronic commerce system for translating between one or more schemas, the system comprising:**

**a global content directory server (Abstract: lines 1-2 and FIG. 4, components 401 and 406) coupled to one or more seller databases, the global content directory server providing a plurality of buyers access to the one or more seller databases;**

(Paragraphs [0088] and [0129], indicate global content directory (FIG. 4, components 401 and 406) providing the buyer access to the seller database).

**And a schema translation tool coupled to the global content (Paragraph [0100], wherein the XML interface is the translation tool part of (coupled) to the matching system), directory server, (Abstract: lines 1-2, the schema translation tool comprising:**

Art Unit: 2165

**a mapping module operable to:**

**receive information regarding a source schema and a target schema, the source and target schemas each comprising a taxonomy comprising a hierarchy of classes into which products may be categorized,**

(FIG. 5 and paragraph [0019], indicate the plurality of schema (XML data files) (buyer and seller)

wherein the profile content grouping parameter is (taxonomy hierarchy of classes)).

**wherein the target schema comprises a different taxonomy then the taxonomy of the source schema,**

(Paragraph [0019], indicate the plurality of schema having different profile content (taxonomy data)).

**at least the source schema further comprising a product ontology associated with one or more of the classes, each product ontology comprising one or more product attributes;**

(FIG. 5 and paragraph [0019], illustrate the association of the buyer and seller based on profile content

(product ontology) parameter (class))

**and associate one or more source classes of the source schema with one or more target classes of the target schema;**

(Paragraph [0019], illustrate the association of the buyer based on a type of service parameter (class) to a seller providing the service or goods)

**and an ontology generation module operable to generate a product ontology for each of the target classes based on the product ontologies of the associated source classes.**

(FIG. 5 and paragraph [0019], illustrate the association of the buyer and seller based on a "best fit" match

(ontology association) of profile attributes(class))

As per claim 2, Livesay discloses:



**The system of Claim 1, wherein the mapping module is further operable to:**

**receive input from at least one of the plurality of buyers indicating one or more source classes to be associated with one or more target classes;**

(Paragraph [0019], illustrate the association of the buyer and seller based on a type of service (product ontology) parameter (class) using buyer profile (buyer input))

**And associate the source classes with the target classes in response to the input from at least one of the plurality of buyers.**

(Paragraph [0019], illustrate the association of the buyer and seller based on a type of service)

As per claim 5, Livesay discloses:

**The system of Claim 1, wherein the ontology generation module is further operable to generate a product ontology for a target class by determining the intersection of the product attributes included in the product ontologies of the associated source classes.**

(Paragraph [0136], wherein the determining profile link based on “best fit” profile content (product ontology) is determining association between product parameters between seller and buyer).

As per claim 6, Livesay discloses:

**The system of Claim 1, wherein the ontology generation module is further operable to generate a product ontology for a parent class of a plurality of target classes by determining the intersection of the product attributes included in the product ontologies of the target classes,**

(Paragraph [0136], wherein the determining profile link with best fit criteria (ontologies) is determining association between product parameters between seller and buyer).

**the product ontologies of the target classes having been generated by the ontology generation module (FIG. 4 and FIG. 5).**

As per claim 7, Livesay discloses:

**The system of Claim 1, wherein:**

**at least the source schema further comprises a seller ontology associated with one or more of the classes, each seller ontology comprising one or more attributes associated with one or more sellers of a product;**

(Paragraph [0136], wherein the determining profile link with best fit criteria (ontologies) is determining association between product parameters (attributes) between seller and buyer).

**And the ontology generation module is further operable to generate a seller ontology for each of the target classes based on the seller ontologies of the associated source classes.**

(Paragraph [0136], wherein the determining profile link with best fit criteria (ontologies) is determining association between product parameters (attributes) between seller and buyer).

As per claim 8, Livesay discloses:

**The system of Claim 1, wherein:**

**one or more pointers identifying the one or more seller databases are associated with at least one source class,**

(Paragraphs [0088] and [0129], indicate the database product identification linking the buyer and seller).

**the one or more seller databases including product data associated with one or more products categorized in the source class;**

(Paragraphs [0088] and [0129], indicate the database product identification linking the buyer and seller).

**and the mapping module is further operable to associate the one or more pointers of the source class with one or more target classes associated with the source class.**

Art Unit: 2165

(Paragraph [0136], wherein the determining profile link with best fit criteria (ontologies) is determining association between product parameters (attributes) between seller and buyer).

As per claim 9, Livesay discloses:

**A method for translating between one or more schemas, comprising:**

**receiving information regarding a source schema and a target schema,**

**the source and target schemas each comprising a taxonomy comprising a hierarchy of classes into which products may be categorized,**

(FIG. 5 and paragraph [0019], indicate the plurality of schema (XML data files) (buyer and seller)

wherein the profile content grouping parameter is (taxonomy hierarchy of classes) ).

**wherein the target schema comprises a different taxonomy then the taxonomy of the source schema,**

(Paragraph [0019], indicate the plurality of schema having different profile content (taxonomy data)).

**at least the source schema further comprising a product ontology associated with one or more of the classes, each product ontology comprising one or more product attributes;**

(FIG. 5 and paragraph [0019], illustrate the association of the buyer and seller based on profile content (product ontology) parameter (class))

**associating one or more source classes of the source schema with one or more target classes of the target schema;**

(FIG. 5, Paragraph [0019], illustrate the association of the buyer based on a profile parameter (class) to a seller providing the service or goods)

**and generating a product ontology for each of the target classes based on the product ontologies of the associated source classes.**

(FIG. 5 and paragraph [0019], illustrate the association of the buyer and seller based on a "best fit" match (ontology association) of profile attributes(class))

As per claim 10, Livesay discloses:

**The method of Claim 9, further comprising:**

**receiving input from at least one of a plurality of buyers indicating one or more source classes to be associated with one or more target classes;**

(Paragraph [0019], illustrate the association of the buyer and seller based on a type of service (product ontology) parameter (class) using buyer profile (buyer input))

**And associating the source classes with the target classes in response to the input from at least one of the plurality of buyers.**

(Paragraph [0019], illustrate the association of the buyer and seller based on a type of service)

As per claim 13, Livesay discloses:

**The method of Claim 9, further comprising generating a product ontology for a target class by determining the intersection of the product attributes included in the product ontologies of the associated source classes.**

(Paragraph [0136], wherein the determining profile link based on “best fit” profile content (product ontology) is determining association between product parameters between seller and buyer).

As per claim 14, Livesay discloses:

**The method of Claim 9, further comprising generating a product ontology for a parent class of a plurality of target classes by determining the intersection of the product attributes included in the product ontologies of the target classes.**

Art Unit: 2165

(Paragraph [0136], wherein the determining profile link based on “best fit” profile content (product ontology) is determining association between product parameters between seller and buyer).

As per claim 15, Livesay discloses:

**The method of Claim 9, wherein:**

**at least the source schema further comprises a seller ontology associated with one or more of the classes, each seller ontology comprising one or more attributes associated with one or more sellers of a product;**

(Paragraph [0136], wherein the determining profile link with best fit criteria (ontologies) is determining association between product parameters (attributes) between seller and buyer).

**and the method further comprises generating a seller ontology for each of the target classes based on the seller ontologies of the associated source classes.**

(Paragraph [0136], wherein the determining profile link with best fit criteria (ontologies) is determining association between product parameters (attributes) between seller and buyer).

As per claim 16, Livesay discloses:

**The method of Claim 9, wherein:**

**one or more pointers identifying one or more seller databases are associated with at least one source class, the seller databases including product data associated with one or more products categorized in the source class;**

(Paragraphs [0088] and [0129], indicate the database product identification linking the buyer and seller).

**and the method further comprises associating the pointers of the source class with one or more target classes associated with the source class.**

Art Unit: 2165

(Paragraph [0136], wherein the determining profile link with best fit criteria (ontologies) is determining association between product parameters (attributes) between seller and buyer).

As per claim 17, Livesay discloses:

**Software for translating between schemas, the software embodied in a computer-readable medium and, when executed, operable to:**

**receive information regarding a source schema and a target schema, the source and target schemas each comprising a taxonomy comprising a hierarchy of classes into which products may be categorized,**

(FIG. 5 and paragraph [0019], indicate the plurality of schema (XML data files) (buyer and seller)

wherein the profile content grouping parameter is (taxonomy hierarchy of classes) ).

**wherein the target schema comprises a different taxonomy then the taxonomy of the source schema,**

(Paragraph [0019], indicate the plurality of schema having different profile content (taxonomy data)).

**at least the source schema further comprising a product ontology associated with one or more of the classes, each product ontology comprising one or more product attributes;**

(FIG. 5 and paragraph [0019], illustrate the association of the buyer and seller based on profile content (product ontology) parameter (class))

**associate one or more source classes of the source schema with one or more target classes of the target schema;**

(FIG. 5, Paragraph [0019], illustrate the association of the buyer based on a profile parameter (class) to a seller proving the service or goods)

Art Unit: 2165

**and generate a product ontology for each of the target classes based on the product ontologies of the associated source classes.**

(FIG. 5 and paragraph [0019], illustrate the association of the buyer and seller based on a “best fit” match (ontology association) of profile attributes(class))

As per claim 18, Livesay discloses:

**The software of Claim 17, further operable to:**

**receive input from at least one of a plurality of buyers indicating one or more source classes to be associated with one or more target classes;**

(Paragraph [0019], illustrate the association of the buyer and seller based on a type of service (product ontology) parameter (class) using buyer profile (buyer input))

**and associate the source classes with the target classes in response to the input from at least one of the plurality of buyers.**

(Paragraph [0019], illustrate the association of the buyer and seller based on a type of service)

As per claim 21, Livesay discloses:

**The software of Claim 17, further operable to generate a product ontology for a target class by determining the intersection of the product attributes included in the product ontologies of the associated source classes.**

(Paragraph [0136], wherein the determining profile link based on “best fit” profile content (product ontology) is determining association between product parameters between seller and buyer).

As per claim 22, Livesay discloses:

Art Unit: 2165

**The software of Claim 17, further operable to generate a product ontology for a parent class of a plurality of target classes by determining the intersection of the product attributes included in the product ontologies of the target classes.**

(Paragraph [0136], wherein the determining profile link based on “best fit” profile content (product ontology) is determining association between product parameters between seller and buyer).

As per claim 23, Livesay discloses:

**The software of Claim 17, wherein:**

**at least the source schema further comprises a seller ontology associated with one or more of the classes, each seller ontology comprising one or more attributes associated with one or more sellers of a product;**

(Paragraph [0136], wherein the determining profile link with best fit criteria (ontologies) is determining association between product parameters (attributes) between seller and buyer).

**and the software is further operable to generate a seller ontology for each of the target classes based on the seller ontologies of the associated source classes.**

(Paragraph [0136], wherein the determining profile link with best fit criteria (ontologies) is determining association between product parameters (attributes) between seller and buyer).

As per claim 24, Livesay discloses:

**The software of Claim 17, wherein:**

**one or more pointers identifying one or more seller databases are associated with at least one source class, the seller databases including product data associated with one or more products categorized in the source class;**

(Paragraphs [0088] and [0129], indicate the database product identification linking the buyer and seller).



Art Unit: 2165

**and the software is further operable to associate the pointers of the source class with one or more target classes associated with the source class.**

(Paragraph [0136], wherein the determining profile link with best fit criteria (ontologies) is determining association between product parameters (attributes) between seller and buyer).

As per claim 25, Livesay discloses:

**A system for translating between schemas, comprising:**

**means for receiving information regarding a source schema and a target schema, the source and target schemas each comprising a taxonomy comprising a hierarchy of classes into which products may be categorized,**

(FIG. 5 and paragraph [0019], indicate the plurality of schema (XML data files) (buyer and seller) wherein the profile content grouping parameter is (taxonomy hierarchy of classes) ).

**wherein the target schema comprises a different taxonomy then the taxonomy of the source schema,**

(Paragraph [0019], indicate the plurality of schema having different profile content (taxonomy data)).

**at least the source schema further comprising a product ontology associated with one or more of the classes, each product ontology comprising one or more product attributes;**

(FIG. 5 and paragraph [0019], illustrate the association of the buyer and seller based on profile content (product ontology) parameter (class))

**means for associating one or more source classes of the source schema with one or more target classes of the target schema;**

(FIG. 5, Paragraph [0019], illustrate the association of the buyer based on a profile parameter (class) to a seller proving the service or goods)

Art Unit: 2165

**and means for generating a product ontology for each of the target classes based on the product ontologies of the associated source classes.**

(FIG. 5 and paragraph [0019], illustrate the association of the buyer and seller based on a “best fit” match (ontology association) of profile attributes(class))

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 3-4, 11-12, 19-20 and 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Livesay, Jeffery et al (hereinafter Livesay) US Publication No 20080126265 in view of Vedula, Nagender et al (hereinafter Vedula) US Patent No. 6823495.

As per claim 3, Livesay discloses the parsing of data profile and the matching of desired service between buyer and seller, but does not go into detail regarding generating a graphical representation of profile content (taxonomy), however in an analogous art of data mapping, Vedula teaches:

**The system of Claim 2, wherein the mapping module is further operable to:**

**generate a graphical representation of the taxonomies of the source and target schemas,**

(Column 4, lines 19-24, wherein the source and target schema trees are graphically presented)

**the graphical representation allowing at least one of the plurality of buyers to graphically associate classes of the source schema with classes of the target schema;**

(Column 4, lines 19-24, wherein the source and target schema trees are graphically presented wherein the buyer is the user)

**and communicate the graphical representation to at least one of the plurality of buyers.**

(Column 4, lines 19-24, wherein the source and target schema trees are graphically presented wherein the buyer is the user)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Vedula and Livesay by incorporating the teaching of Vedula into the method of Livesay. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to use the graphical representation of buyer and seller schema mechanism of Vedula into the system of Livesay for the purpose of providing a graphical tree hierarchical structure of target schemas.

As per claim 4, Livesay discloses the parsing of data profile and the matching of desired service between buyer and seller, but does not go into detail regarding generating a graphical representation of profile, however in an analogous art of data mapping, Vedula teaches:

**The system of Claim 1, wherein the source classes are leaf classes of the source schema.**

(FIG. 1, wherein field1 is leaf entry of source schema).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Vedula and Livesay by incorporating the teaching of Vedula into the method of Livesay. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to use the graphical

Art Unit: 2165

representation of buyer schema mechanism of Vedula into the system of Livesay for the purpose of providing a graphical tree hierarchical structure of target schemas.

As per claim 11, Livesay discloses the parsing of data profile and the matching of desired service between buyer and seller, but does not go into detail regarding generating a graphical representation of profile content (taxonomy), however in an analogous art of data mapping, Vedula teaches:

**generating a graphical representation of the taxonomies of the source and target schemas,**

(Column 4, lines 19-24, wherein the source and target schema trees are graphically presented)

**the graphical representation allowing at least one of the plurality of buyers to graphically associate classes of the source schema with classes of the target schema;**

(Column 4, lines 19-24, wherein the source and target schema trees are graphically presented wherein the buyer is the user)

**and communicating the graphical representation to at least one of the plurality of buyers.**

(Column 4, lines 19-24, wherein the source and target schema trees are graphically presented wherein the buyer is the user)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Vedula and Livesay by incorporating the teaching of Vedula into the method of Livesay. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to use the graphical representation of buyer and seller schema mechanism of Vedula into the system of Livesay for the purpose of providing a graphical tree hierarchical structure of target schemas.

As per claim 12, Livesay discloses the parsing of data profile and the matching of desired service between buyer and seller, but does not go into detail regarding generating a graphical representation of profile,

Art Unit: 2165

however in an analogous art of data mapping, Vedula teaches:

**The method of Claim 9, wherein the source classes are leaf classes of the source schema.**

(FIG. 1, wherein field1 is leaf entry of source schema).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Vedula and Livesay by incorporating the teaching of Vedula into the method of Livesay. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to use the graphical representation of buyer schema mechanism of Vedula into the system of Livesay for the purpose of providing a graphical tree hierarchical structure of target schemas.

As per claim 19, Livesay discloses the parsing of data profile and the matching of desired service between buyer and seller, but does not go into detail regarding generating a graphical representation of profile content (taxonomy), however in an analogous art of data mapping, Vedula teaches:

**generating a graphical representation of the taxonomies of the source and target schemas,**

(Column 4, lines 19-24, wherein the source and target schema trees are graphically presented)

**the graphical representation allowing at least one of the plurality of buyers to graphically associate classes of the source schema with classes of the target schema;**

(Column 4, lines 19-24, wherein the source and target schema trees are graphically presented wherein the buyer is the user)

**and communicating the graphical representation to at least one of the plurality of buyers.**

(Column 4, lines 19-24, wherein the source and target schema trees are graphically presented wherein the buyer is the user)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Vedula and Livesay by incorporating the teaching of Vedula into the method of Livesay. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to use the graphical

Art Unit: 2165

representation of buyer and seller schema mechanism of Vedula into the system of Livesay for the purpose of providing a graphical tree hierarchical structure of target schemas.

As per claim 20, Livesay discloses the parsing of data profile and the matching of desired service between buyer and seller, but does not go into detail regarding generating a graphical representation of profile, however in an analogous art of data mapping, Vedula teaches:

**The software of Claim 17, wherein the source classes are leaf classes of the source schema.**

(FIG. 1, wherein field1 is leaf entry of source schema).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Vedula and Livesay by incorporating the teaching of Vedula into the method of Livesay. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to use the graphical representation of buyer schema mechanism of Vedula into the system of Livesay for the purpose of providing a graphical tree hierarchical structure of target schemas.

As per claim 26, Livesay discloses:

**A schema translation tool coupled with a global content**

**directory server** (Paragraph [0100], wherein the XML interface is the translation tool part of (coupled) to the matching system), **the schema translation tool, comprising:**

**a mapping module operable to:**

**receive information regarding a source schema and a target schema, the source**

**and target schemas each comprising a taxonomy comprising a hierarchy of classes into which products may be categorized,**

(FIG. 5 and paragraph [0019], indicate the plurality of schema (XML data files) (buyer and seller) wherein the profile content grouping parameter is (taxonomy hierarchy of classes)).

Art Unit: 2165

**wherein the target schema comprises a different taxonomy then the taxonomy of the source schema,**

(Paragraph [0019], indicate the plurality of schema having different profile content (taxonomy data)).

**at least the source schema further comprising a product ontology associated with one or more of the classes, each product ontology comprising one or more product attributes,**

(FIG. 5 and paragraph [0019], illustrate the association of the buyer and seller based on “best fit” profile content (product ontology) parameter (attributes))

**at least the source schema further comprising one or more pointers identifying one or more seller databases and associated with one or more classes,**

(Paragraphs [0088] and [0129], indicate the database product identification linking the buyer and seller).

**the seller databases including product data associated with one or more products categorized in the classes;**

(Paragraphs [0088] and [0129], indicate the database product parameter (classes) identification linking the buyer and seller).

**receive input from at least one of the plurality of buyers indicating one or more source classes of the source schema to be associated with one or more target classes of the target schema;**

(Paragraph [0019], illustrate the association of the buyer and seller based on a type of service (product ontology) parameter (class) using buyer profile (buyer input))

**associate one or more source classes with one or more target classes in response to the input from at least one of the plurality of buyers;**

(Paragraph [0019], illustrate the association of the buyer and seller based on a type of service)

**and associate the pointers of the source classes with one or more target classes associated with the source class;**

(Paragraph [0136], wherein the determining profile link with best fit criteria (ontologies) is determining association between product parameters (attributes) between seller and buyer).

Art Unit: 2165

**and an ontology generation module operable to generate a product ontology for each of the target classes based on the intersection of the product attributes included in the product ontologies of the associated source classes.**

(Paragraph [0136], wherein the determining profile link based on “best fit” profile content (product ontology) is determining association between product parameters between seller and buyer).

Livesay discloses the parsing of data profile and the matching of desired service between buyer and seller, but does not go into detail regarding generating a graphical representation of profile content (taxonomy), however in an analogous art of data mapping, Vedula teaches:

**generate a graphical representation of the taxonomies of the source and target schemas,**

(Column 4, lines 19-24, wherein the source and target schema trees are graphically presented)

**the graphical representation allowing at least one of a plurality of buyers to graphically associate the classes of the source schema with classes of the target schema;**

(Column 4, lines 19-24, wherein the source and target schema trees are graphically presented)

**communicate the graphical representation to at least one of the plurality of buyers;**

(Column 4, lines 19-24, wherein the source and target schema trees are graphically presented wherein the buyer is the user)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Vedula and Livesay by incorporating the teaching of Vedula into the method of Livesay. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to use the graphical representation of buyer and seller schema mechanism of Vedula into the system of Livesay for the purpose of providing a graphical tree hierarchical structure of target schemas.

As per claim 27, Livesay discloses:

**A method for translating between schemas, comprising:**



Art Unit: 2165

**receiving information regarding a source schema and a target schema, the source and target schemas each comprising a taxonomy comprising a hierarchy of classes into which products may be categorized,**

(FIG. 5 and paragraph [0019], indicate the plurality of schema (XML data files) (buyer and seller) wherein the profile content grouping parameter is (taxonomy hierarchy of classes) ).

**at least the source schema further comprising a product ontology associated with one or more of the classes, each product ontology comprising one or more product attributes,**

(FIG. 5 and paragraph [0019], illustrate the association of the buyer and seller based on profile content (product ontology) parameter (class))

**at least the source schema further comprising one or more pointers identifying one or more seller databases and associated with one or more classes,**

(Paragraphs [0088] and [0129], indicate the database product identification linking the buyer and seller).

**the seller databases including product data associated with one or more products categorized in the classes;**

(Paragraphs [0088] and [0129], indicate the database product parameter (classes) identification linking the buyer and seller).

**receiving input from at least one of the plurality of buyers indicating one or more source classes of the source schema to be associated with one or more target classes of the target schema;**

(Paragraph [0019], illustrate the association of the buyer and seller based on a type of service (product ontology) parameter (class) using buyer profile (buyer input))

**associating one or more source classes with one or more target classes in response to the input from at least one of the plurality of buyers;**

(Paragraph [0019], illustrate the association of the buyer and seller based on a type of service)

Art Unit: 2165

**associating the pointers of the source classes with one or more target classes associated with the source class;**

(Paragraph [0136], wherein the determining profile link with best fit criteria (ontologies) is determining association between product parameters (attributes) between seller and buyer).

**and generating a product ontology for each of the target classes based on the intersection of the product attributes included in the product ontologies of the associated source classes.**

(Paragraph [0136], wherein the determining profile link based on “best fit” profile content (product ontology) is determining association between product parameters between seller and buyer).

Livesay discloses the parsing of data profile and the matching of desired service between buyer and seller, but does not go into detail regarding generating a graphical representation of profile content (taxonomy), however in an analogous art of data mapping, Vedula teaches:

**generate a graphical representation of the taxonomies of the source and target schemas,**

(Column 4, lines 19-24, wherein the source and target schema trees are graphically presented)

**the graphical representation allowing at least one of a plurality of buyers to graphically associate the classes of the source schema with classes of the target schema;**

(Column 4, lines 19-24, wherein the source and target schema trees are graphically presented)

**communicate the graphical representation to at least one of the plurality of buyers;**

(Column 4, lines 19-24, wherein the source and target schema trees are graphically presented wherein the buyer is the user)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Vedula and Livesay by incorporating the teaching of Vedula into the method of Livesay. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to use the graphical representation of buyer and seller schema mechanism of Vedula into the system of Livesay for the purpose of providing a graphical tree hierarchical structure of target schemas.

As per claim 28, Livesay discloses:

**Software for translating between schemas, the software embodied in a computer-readable medium and, when executed, operable to:**

**receive information regarding a source schema and a target schema, the source and target schemas each comprising a taxonomy comprising a hierarchy of classes into which products may be categorized,**

(FIG. 5 and paragraph [0019], indicate the plurality of schema (XML data files) (buyer and seller) wherein the profile content grouping parameter is (taxonomy hierarchy of classes) ).

**at least the source schema further comprising a product ontology associated with one or more of the classes, each product ontology comprising one or more product attributes,**

(FIG. 5 and paragraph [0019], illustrate the association of the buyer and seller based on profile content (product ontology) parameter (class))

**at least the source schema further comprising one or more pointers identifying one or more seller databases and associated with one or more classes,**

(Paragraphs [0088] and [0129], indicate the database product identification linking the buyer and seller).

**the seller databases including product data associated with one or more products categorized in the classes;**

(Paragraphs [0088] and [0129], indicate the database product parameter (classes) identification linking the buyer and seller).

**receive input from at least one of the plurality of buyers indicating one or more source classes of the source schema to be associated with one or more target classes of the target schema;**

Art Unit: 2165

(Paragraph [0019], illustrate the association of the buyer and seller based on a type of service (product ontology) parameter (class) using buyer profile (buyer input))

**associate one or more source classes with one or more target classes in response to the input from at least one of the plurality of buyers;**

(Paragraph [0019], illustrate the association of the buyer and seller based on a type of service)

**associate the pointers of the source classes with one or more target classes associated with the source class;**

(Paragraph [0136], wherein the determining profile link with best fit criteria (ontologies) is determining association between product parameters (attributes) between seller and buyer).

**and generate a product ontology for each of the target classes based on the intersection of the product attributes included in the product ontologies of the associated source classes.**

(Paragraph [0136], wherein the determining profile link based on “best fit” profile content (product ontology) is determining association between product parameters between seller and buyer).

Livesay discloses the parsing of data profile and the matching of desired service between buyer and seller, but does not go into detail regarding generating a graphical representation of profile content (taxonomy), however in an analogous art of data mapping, Vedula teaches:

**generate a graphical representation of the taxonomies of the source and target schemas,**

(Column 4, lines 19-24, wherein the source and target schema trees are graphically presented)

**the graphical representation allowing at least one of a plurality of buyers to graphically associate the classes of the source schema with classes of the target schema;**

(Column 4, lines 19-24, wherein the source and target schema trees are graphically presented)

**communicate the graphical representation to at least one of the plurality of buyers;**

(Column 4, lines 19-24, wherein the source and target schema trees are graphically presented wherein the buyer is the user)

Art Unit: 2165

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Vedula and Livesay by incorporating the teaching of Vedula into the method of Livesay. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to use the graphical representation of buyer and seller schema mechanism of Vedula into the system of Livesay for the purpose of providing a graphical tree hierarchical structure of target schemas.

### **Conclusion**

As necessitated by amendment, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tarek Chbouki whose telephone number is 571-2703154. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:00 am to 6:00 pm EST. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chace Christian can be reached on 571-2724190. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained

Art Unit: 2165

from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Tarek Chbouki/

Examiner, Art Unit 2165

11/10/2008

**/Christian P. Chace/**

**Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2165**